

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Action. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing.

Claims 23-24, 29-31, 53 and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patent Publication GB 2 325 548 to Nabavi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,161,182 to Nadooshan. Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being upatentable over Nabavi in view of Nadooshan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,280,527 to Gullman et al. Claim 59 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being upatentable over Nabavi in view of JP 363033088A to Horii and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,504,479 to Lemons. Claim 60 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being upatentable over Nabavi in view of Nadooshan. Claim 61 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being upatentable over Nabavi in view of Nadooshan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,412,708 to Katz. Claims 62-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Nabavi in view of Nadooshan and further in view of Lemons and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/01 72396A1 to Vanska et al. Finally, Claims 67-71 and 72-75 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nabavi in view of Nadooshan and/or Nabavi in view of Nadooshan and further in view of Lemons and Vanska et al.

In response, the Applicants respectfully traverse the various rejections of Claims 23-25, 29-31, 53 and 58-75 set forth above and instead submit that Claims 23-25, 29-31, 53 and 58-75, as above amended, are neither taught nor suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the various rejections of Claims 23-25, 29-31, 53 and 58-75 and the allowance of these claims.

The cited art has been carefully considered and neither teaches nor suggests Applicants' invention as defined by Claims 23-25, 29-31, 53 and 58-75, as above amended. Applicants'

invention is directed to a system and method for remote monitoring of a premises which includes a security gateway located at the premises to be remotely monitored, a security system server and a remote client. Unlike the systems and methods disclosed in the cited art, Applicants' claimed system and method is configured such that, in response to authentication of the remote user by the security system server, both the remote client and the security gateway receive authorization information. When the remote client subsequently transmits the access information received from the security system server to the security gateway, a determination as to whether the remote client shall be granted access to the security gateway is based upon both the access information that the security gateway receives from the remote client and the access information the access information that the security gateway receives directly from the security system server. Such a feature is clearly distinguishable from Nadooshan, where there is neither a teaching nor a suggestion of token generating server 300 directly transmitting access information to remote equipment 140. See, for example, FIG. 2 of Nadooshan.

Applicants' claimed system and method may be further distinguished from the cited art based upon the process by which a signal is activated at the premises to notify an occupant thereof that remote monitoring of the premises is occurring. More specifically, in accordance with Applicants' claimed system and method, the security gateway initiates generation of the signal that notifies occupants of the premises that remote monitoring is occurring whenever the security gateway is in the process of transferring information, for example, by streaming video and/or audio data, to the remote client. Such a feature is clearly distinguishable from Katz, where, based upon the data received from the monitored premises, a user at a remote location decides whether to issue a notification signal that monitoring is occurring.

Each of the claims pending before the Examiner include one or both of the aforementioned features, both of which distinguish Applicants' claimed system and method over the cited art. It is submitted, therefore, that Claims 23-25, 29-31, 53 and 58-75, as above amended, are neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. For this reason, the Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the various rejections applied against Claims 23-25, 29-31, 53 and 58-75 and the allowance of these claims.

This application is now considered to be in condition for allowance. A prompt Notice to that effect is, therefore, earnestly solicited.


It is believed that there are no fees due in connection with this communication. If fees are due, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1515.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

March 6, 2006

Conley Rose, P.C.  
5700 Granite Parkway, Suite 330  
Dallas, Texas 75024  
(972) 731-2288 (Telephone)  
(972) 731-2289 (Facsimile)



Michael S. Bush  
Reg. No. 31,745

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS